UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,493	09/26/2005	Michael Bauer	BAUE3002/JJC	4664
23364 BACON & THO	7590 10/05/200 OMAS, PLLC	EXAMINER		
625 SLATERS	LANE	ANDLER, MICHAEL S		
FOURTH FLO ALEXANDRIA	or A, VA 22314-1176	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2876	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/550,493	BAUER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
	/ O		

	Michael Andler	2876	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 September 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a considered and amendment (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a considered and the consid	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4 and 6-18</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	t before or on the date of filing a No	otice of Appeal will <u>not</u>	be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing.	a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the	date of filing a brief, w	rill <u>not</u> be
entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	and was not earlier presented. Se	ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)) .
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	r i 0/56/06) Paper No(s)		
/Michael G Lee/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2876			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 11 are moot since the amendment has not been entered. Applicant has proposed amending claims 1 and 11 to incorporate limitations from dependent claim 14, specifically the limitation of "wherein the recess with the integrated circuit being closed by a self-adhesive covering element", whereas claim 2 previously did not recite the limitation of "self-adhesive". Applicant's amendment has not been entered since the added limitation is not sufficient to avoid the cited prior art reference of Royer (US 7,168,623).

Regarding applicant's argument that the cited reference of Royer does not teach a self-adhesive covering element, the examiner would respectfully point out the analogous resin of Royer that is used to close the slot of the RFID label (Fig 9, items 21-22) is capable of "attaching" a chip to the base substrate (See Col 1, line 53). The examiner would further point out that a resin drop with self-adhesive properties for attaching itself and other objects to a substrate would be correctly referred to in the general lexicon as a "self-adhesive resin". Applicant is invited to consider adding further limitations in order to distinguish applicant's covering element from Royer's analogous resin drop, as well as other forms of encapsulates that are known in the art.

Claims 1-4 and 6-18 remain rendered obvious by the prior art as previously stated in the Office Action dated 8 June 2009.